DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 599 EA 024 043

AUTHOR Flanigan, J. L.; Richardson, M. D.
TITLE Analysis of Educational Administration Programs in Doctoral Granting Institutions.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Professors of Education (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *College Programs; *Doctoral Degrees; *Doctoral Programs; Doctor of Arts Degrees; *Educational Administration; *Graduate School Faculty; Graduate Study; Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS *United States (Southeast)

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that analyzed the characteristics of educational administration programs in doctoral granting institutions are presented in this paper. Questionnaires mailed to the department of educational administration chairpersons at 40 universities in the south central United States yielded 28 responses. Slightly over half of the respondents (15) reported the enrollment of 10 or fewer full-time doctoral students. A great disparity was found in the ratios of full-time staff to doctoral students. No clearly defined methods existed for distinguishing the overlap between department of educational administration faculty positions and other departments. Departments lacked a common area of faculty expertise, which raises the question of whether educational administration programs resulted from program direction or from individual faculty members' expertise. Eight tables and one figure are included. (2 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS IN DOCTORAL GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

ED346599

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Richardson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

J. L. FLANIGAN
M. D. RICHARDSON

A paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the **Society of Professors of Education** in San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992.

Jack Flanigan is Associate Professor at and Coordinator of Educational Administration; **Mike Richardson** is Associate Professor and Coordinator of Doctoral Programs; both at **Clemson University**, Clemson, SC 29634 (803-656-3482).

EA 024043

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS IN DOCTORAL GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

ABSTRACT

The recent wave of educational reform has forced many institutions of higher learning to critically examine their role in education, mission, and basis for existence. One of the areas most often criticized has been the educational administration programs, performing either for certification purposes or for doctoral level preparation. As some institutions question their status in a changing world, others question why a doctorate in educational administration is not offered by their institution. Many policy-makers have advanced concerns about the number and quality of professors in the college, the potential number of students, the availability of funds for fellowships, and the ability of the faculty to respond to a new educational vision. This vision should consider that "the overall trend is that the proportion of departments granting smaller numbers of degrees has risen markedly, while the proportion granting larger numbers has declined correspondingly." Furthermore, university administrators and developers should heed the

words of Herbert Waltzer when he said, "the department is where most teaching, service, and research activities go on, where faculty members pursue professional and disciplinary interests..., and where students pursue their education... The university's success depends on the success of its academic departments." The information should be made available to both state and university policy-makers, as well as shared with similar institutions through national exposure.

A questionnaire was developed, field-tested, and administered to forty higher education institutions, twenty-eight of which responded for a seventy percent response rate. A primary issue of the research was the number of full-time and part-time students currently enrolled who were pursuing the doctorate in educational administration. A major interest is a comparison between the number of faculty in educational administration and the number of full-time and part-time doctorate students enrolled in educational administration programs.

Chairpersons of Departments of Educational Administration responding to the questions were asked to identify the number of full-time faculty members in their department. The results of the survey revealed no distinction between positions that were totally educational administration and those which overlapped other departments. The largest number of universities (6) reported six full-time members in their departments of educational administration.

Survey respondents listed thirty-six possible areas of faculty expertise. Results indicated no common areas of expertise in every

university. Of the thirty-six areas listed, five areas had the highest frequency of response: school law, school finance, organizational management theory and development, personnel administration, and supervision.

One of the survey objectives was to determine the number of full-time doctoral students in educational administration. The largest number of responding universities (9) indicated five or fewer full-time doctoral students were majoring in educational administration.

Probably the area of greatest disparity found in this brief survey was the ratios of full-time staff members in educational administration and to the number of doctoral students at each institution. The survey results indicated extremes as evidenced by one university which reported no full-time faculty in educational administration but four full-time doctoral students. The research found the greatest number of responding universities (10) reporting fifty or fewer part-time doctoral students.

The survey results showed six universities which had a range from 115 part-time students to 270 part-time students. By comparison the number of full-time faculty ranged from five to ten members. The number of part-time students ranged from a low of twenty part-time students with a full-time faculty of fourteen to a high of 270 part-time students with a full-time faculty of nine. The universities with the least number of part-time doctoral students revealed a range from twenty students to forty-two students. A comparison with the faculty of these six

universities revealed a low of zero full-time faculty to a high of fourteen full-time faculty members.

A third portion of this research analyzed the least frequently reported areas of faculty expertise and course offerings. The results indicated that the area of greatest diversity was course offerings. Typically, what made the difference in each university program was the widely diverse areas of staff expertise. The question then became whether the existing programs were a result of program directives, or did the expertise of the individual faculty members dictate programs which fueled this diversity. In other words, were faculty selected to meet program needs, or were programs designed around the expertise of faculty? This brief study did not provide the answer, but rather posed the question for further study. The results of this brief survey revealed no clearly defined methods for distinguishing the departments of education administration from those which overlapped in other departments.

INTRODUCTION

The recent wave of educational reform has forced many institutions of higher learning to critically examine their role in education, mission, and basis for existence. One of the areas most often criticized has been the educational administration programs, performing either for certification purposes or for doctoral level preparation. As some institutions question their status in a changing world, others question

why a doctorate in educational administration is not offered by their institution. Many policy-makers have advanced concerns about the number and quality of professors in the college, the potential number of students, the availability of funds for fellowships, and the ability of the faculty to respond to a new educational vision. This vision should consider that "the overall trend is that the proportion of departments granting smaller numbers of degrees has risen markedly, while the proportion granting larger numbers has declined correspondingly" (Tiemann & Van Valey, 1975). Furthermore, university administrators and developers should heed the words of Herbert Waltzer when he said, "the department is where most teaching, service, and research activities go on, where faculty members pursue professional and disciplinary interests..., and where students pursue their education... The university's success depends on the success of its academic departments" (1975, pp. 4-5). The information should be made available to both state and university policy-makers, as well as shared with similar institutions through national exposure.

RATIONALE

A questionnaire was developed, field-tested, and administered to forty higher education institutions, twenty-eight of which responded for a seventy percent response rate. A primary issue of the research was the number of full-time and part-time students currently enrolled who were

pursuing the doctorate in educational administration. A major interest is a comparison between the number of faculty in educational administration and the number of full-time and part-time doctorate students enrolled in educational administration programs.

METHODOLOGY

The researchers developed and field tested a questionnaire that was used to solicit the information contained in this report. The researchers selected forty universities in the south central United States for this study. The universities chosen included private, land grant, and regional comprehensive institutions.

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

Chairpersons of Department of Educational Administration responding to the questions were asked to identify the number of full-time faculty members in their department. The results of the survey revealed no distinction between positions that were totally educational administration and those which overlapped other departments. For the benefit of the brief project, the number reported by each department head was used for calculation; no attempt was made to determine which departments were combined with other programs or to validate the information provided. As reflected in Table I of the twenty-eight

institutions responding, ten reported a total of five to eight full-time faculty members. However, four universities reported four or fewer full-time staff members in the department of educational administration. The largest number of universities (6) reported six full-time members in their departments of educational administration. Of the twenty-eight department heads who responded to the initial questionnaire, twenty-six indicated they had a doctoral program in educational administration.

EXPERTISE OF FACULTY

Survey respondents listed thirty-six possible areas of faculty expertise. Results indicated no common areas of expertise in every university. Of the thirty-six areas listed, five areas had the highest frequency of response: school law, school finance, organizational management theory and development, personnel administration, and supervision. On this basis of expertise, the researchers concluded that these areas are a common core of expertise in the Educational Administration Programs at the responding universities. Further analysis indicated that most educational administration programs required this common core of classes of all students.

When examining the areas of second highest expertise, the researchers typically found areas of special preparation to be predominantly research, then evaluation, policy development, theory, and curriculum. The researchers concluded this was a logical sequence of

program evaluation. The core of the program, as previously outlined, would be developed first, while other areas could be developed later.

The area of least expertise covered a very broad area, although in some cases there was an allowance for special preparation programs (see Figure I). A close analysis of the survey results revealed that universities described their courses in a variety of ways (see Table III).

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME DOCTORAL STUDENTS

One of the survey objectives was to determine the number of full -time doctoral students in educational administration. The largest number of responding universities (9) indicated five or fewer full-time doctoral students were majoring in educational administration. The next largest group of universities (6) reported six to ten full-time doctoral students, and four universities indicated an enrollment of eleven to fifteen full-time doctoral students. Table IV provides a further analysis of full-time doctoral students.

SUPPORT FOR FULL-TIME DOCTORAL STUDENTS

The results of this survey indicated a great disparity in the amount of financial support provided to full-time doctoral students in educational administration. The majority of universities provided some monetary assistance to help defray costs with $9,000 per academic year. The

second largest number of universities (5) provided assistance between $3,000 and $6,000 per academic year. On the low side, three universities provided no assistance to full-time doctoral students. Further examination revealed that two of the universities gave assistance between $9,001 to $12,000, while two others gave from $15,001 to $20,000 to the full-time doctoral student. However, the survey questionnaire made no attempt to determine eligibility requirements for doctoral students to receive assistance from the reporting universities (see Table V).

FULL-TIME FACULTY COMPARED TO FULL-TIME STUDENTS

Probably the area of greatest disparity found in this brief survey was the ratio of full-time staff members in educational administration and to the number of doctoral students at each institution. The survey results indicated extremes as evidenced by one university which reported no full -time faculty in educational administration but four full-time doctoral students. Another university reported eleven full-time faculty positions but only six full-time doctoral students. The most common number of full -time faculty members, six, was reported by six different universities. The research found a large discrepancy in the number of full-time faculty members when compared to full-time doctoral students (see Table VI).

The research found the greatest number of responding universities (10) reporting fifty or fewer part-time doctoral students. The second

largest number of universities (6) reported 51 to 100 part-time students pursuing the doctorate in educational administration. Only one university reported more than 200 part-time doctoral students majoring in educational administration (see Table VII).

PART-TIME STUDENTS TO FULL-TIME FACULTY

The survey results showed six universities which had a range from 115 part-time students to 270 part-time students. By comparison the number of full-time faculty ranged from five to ten members. The number of part-time students ranged from a low of twenty part-time students with a full-time faculty of fourteen to a high of 270 part-time students with a full-time faculty of nine. The universities with the least number of part-time doctoral students revealed a range from twenty students to forty-two students. A comparison with the faculty of these six universities revealed a low of zero full-time faculty to a high of fourteen full-time faculty members. Refer to Table VIII.

THE UNKNOWN FACTOR

A third portion of this research analyzed the least frequently reported areas of faculty expertise and course offerings. The results indicated that the area of greatest diversity was course offerings. Typically, what made the difference in each university program was the

widely diverse areas of staff expertise. The question then became whether the existing programs were a result of program directives, or did the expertise of the individual faculty members dictate programs which fueled this diversity. In other words, were faculty selected to meet program needs, or were programs designed around the expertise of faculty? This brief study did not provide the answer, but rather posed the question for further study.

CONCLUSION

The results of this brief survey revealed no clearly defined methods for distinguishing the departments of education administration from those which overlapped in other departments. The largest number of universities (6) reported six full-time faculty members in their department of educational administration. However, the number of full -time faculty members ranged from zero to fourteen.

Survey results also indicated no common areas of faculty expertise in every university. A common core of faculty expertise was hypothesized. The survey also revealed that the largest number of universities had five or fewer full-time doctoral students and that the majority of universities provided some monetary assistance to the full-time doctoral students. Researchers found the greatest diversity in faculty specialization in educational administration. Finally, the researchers questioned whether programs in educational administration were a result of program

direction or a result of the interest and expertise of individual faculty members.

REFERENCES

Tiemann, K. & Van Valey, T. (1990). Chairs of graduate departments: A structural profile. Teaching Sociology, 18, 13-18.

Waltzer, H. (1975). *The Job of Academic Department Chairman: Experience and Recommendations from Miami University.* American Council on Education, Washington D.C.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME STAFF MEMBERS

FULL-TIME STAFF	NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES
0	2
1-4	4
5-8	10
9-14	9
No Doctoral Program	3
TOTAL	**28**

TABLE II

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STAFF

UNIVERSITIES	FULL-TIME STAFF
2	0
1	3
3	4
2	5
6	6
2	7
0	8
3	9
3	10
1	11
0	12
1	13
1	14
3	N/A
28	**TOTAL**

TABLE III

RANK ORDER OF EXPERTISE AMONG PARTICIPANTS

AREA OF EXPERTISE	FREQUENCY
School Law	20
School Finance	17
Organizational Theory	12
Personnel Administration	11
Supervision	11
Principalship	9
Research	7
Evaluation	5
Politics	5
Theory	5
Curriculum	5
Higher Education	5
Community Relations	4
School Boards	3
Foundations of Education	3
Leadership	3
History of Education	3
Public Relations	3
Techniques of Computer Applications	3
Facilities Planning and Communications	2
Internship	2
Community Education	1
Special Ed. Administration	1
Spelling	1
Information Systems	1
Secondary Education	1
Elementary Education	1
Special Education	1
Multicultural & Research	1
Program Evaluation	1
Rural Education	1
Planning Theory	1
Comparative Education	1
Gifted Education	1
Adult Education	1
Policy Analysis	1

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME DOCTORAL STUDENTS

FULL-TIME DOCTORAL	NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES
0 - 5	9
6 - 10	7
11 - 15	4
16 - 20	2
21 - 25	0
26 - 30	1
N/A	2
TOTALS	**28**

TABLE V

GRANT SUPPORT FOR FULL-TIME

DOCTORAL STUDENTS PER ACADEMIC YEAR

$ U.S. Per Year	NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES
Less than $3,000	3
3,000 - 6,000	5
6,000 - 9,000	7
9,001 - 12,000	2
12,001 - 15,000	0
15,001 - 20,000	2
No Support	3
No Doctoral Program	3
No Information	2
TOTALS	**28**

TABLE VI

FULL-TIME FACULTY VS FULL-TIME STUDENTS

FULL-TIME FACULTY	FULL-TIME STUDENTS
11	6
4	4
5	10
6	16
10	10
7	20
10	3
N/A	N/A
5	12
6	6
N/A	N/A
6	4
10	4
9	3
4	6
6	30
9	2
N/A	2
6	0
3	10
4	6
13	15
0	2
6	1
7	15
9	13
14	14
TOTALS 164.5 (X = 7.4)	**214 (X = 8.5)**

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF PART TIME DOCTORAL STUDENTS

NUMBER OF PART-TIME DOCTORAL STUDENTS	NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES
0 - 50	11
51 - 100	7
101 - 150	3
151 - 200	2
201 - 250	0
250 - 300	1
No doctoral program	3
No information	1
TOTAL	**28**

TABLE VIII

FULL-TIME FACULTY VS. PART-TIME STUDENTS

FULL-TIME STAFF	PART-TIME STUDENTS
11	70
4	25
5	115
6	50
10	50
7	180
10	133
N/A	N/A
5	42
6	163
N/A	N/A
6	20
10	35
9	2270
4	77
6	79
9	130
N/A	30
3	44
6	40
4	75
13	20

FIGURE 1

MODEL OF EXPERTISE AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT